KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD & EVANS, P.L.L.C.
SUMNER SQUARE
1615 M STREET, N.W.
SUITE 400
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-3209

(202) 326-7900
FACSIMILE:
(202) 326-7999

MICHAEL K. KELLOGG
PETER W. HUBER
MARK C. HANSEN
K. CHRIS TODD
MARK L. EVANS
STEVEN F. BENZ
NEIL M. GORSUCH
GEOFFREY M. KLINEBERG
REID M. FIGEL
HENK BRANDS

SEAN A. LEV
EVAN T. LEO
ANTONIA M. APPS
MICHAEL J. GUZMAN
AARON M. PANNER
DAVID E. ROSS
SILVIJA A. STRIKIS
WILLIAM J. CONYNGHAM
RICHARD H. STERN, OF COUNSEL
SHANLON WU, OF COUNSEL

October 22, 2001

Ex Parte Presentation

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: *Joint Application by SBC Communications Inc., et al. for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Arkansas and Missouri*, CC Docket No. 01-194

Dear Ms. Salas:

On behalf of SBC Communications Inc. ("SBC") and at the request of FCC staff, I am attaching a response to the Ex parte Letter from Richard E. Young, Esq., Sidley, Austin, Brown & Wood, to Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary, FCC (Oct. 16, 2001). Moreover, the attachment also responds to certain additional questions raised by the staff concerning the loop maintenance operations system. A single page of the attached response contains information that is confidential.

According to the Commission's rules governing confidential communications, I am enclosing one original copy of this letter with the page of the response that contains confidential information. Inquiries regarding access to the confidential material submitted with this letter should be addressed to Kevin Walker, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd & Evans, PLLC, 1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C., 20036, (202) 367-7820.

In light of the FCC's recent Public Notice, DA 01-2436 (Oct. 17, 2001), SBC will file the redacted version of this letter electronically through the Commission's electronic comment filing system. SBC will file the confidential version of this letter by hand at the FCC's Capitol Heights facility located at 9300 East Hampton Drive,

REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

Ex Parte Presentation

Capitol Heights, Maryland, 20743. Thank you for your kind assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey M. Klineberg

Attachment

cc: Scott Bergmann
Gary Remondino
Uzoma Onyeije
Layla Seirafi
Dana Joyce
Arthur H. Stuenkel
Qualex International (Redacted Version Only)

REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

In its most recent filing, AT&T fails once again to identify a single end-user trouble report that it could not submit electronically as a result of the posting of service orders to LMOS. The record in this proceeding, therefore, is still bereft of any evidence that the status of UNE-P line records in the LMOS database has had any impact on the ability of CLECs to attract and retain end-user customers.

Moreover, AT&T evidently has no answer to SWBT's definitive refutation of AT&T's unsupported claim that "[m]ost of the troubles" that its end users experience "occur within the first 72 hours after provisioning." AT&T's Willard/Van de Water Decl. ¶ 32; see LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 38 (in fact, less than 2.5 percent of all AT&T trouble tickets are submitted during this time). Of course, the lack of evidence has not prevented AT&T from continuing to assert that the first three days after conversion are "the critical period" when "trouble is likely." Ex parte Letter from Richard E. Young to Magalie Roman Salas at 4, CC Docket No. 01-194 (Oct. 16, 2001) ("Ex parte Letter").

Finally, it remains undisputed that the number of trouble tickets potentially affected by any delay in the posting of UNE-P service orders to LMOS is extremely small – amounting to less than two-tenths of one percent of the UNE-P service orders submitted. See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 48. As explained below, SWBT's analysis of the posting of UNE-P orders to LMOS already accounted for the potential effects of CABS bill processing and "interim status." Based on that analysis (which, in turn, is based on actual evidence in the record), for every 500 UNE-P orders submitted, a CLEC will attempt to open roughly six trouble tickets. Upon opening those tickets, the CLEC is likely to find that, while it can successfully open five of those tickets electronically, it can open the fifth only by using SWBT's manual processes.

At the end of the day, the entirety of AT&T's complaint boils down to the fact that, for every 500 UNE-P service orders it submits, it can expect to experience problems in opening one trouble ticket electronically as a result of an LMOS posting delay. There is simply no plausible claim – much less any evidence – that AT&T or any CLEC is placed at a competitive disadvantage by being unable to open electronic trouble reports on such an infinitesimal percentage of its UNE-P service orders.[1]

CABS BILLING PERIODS

1. In its most recent filing, AT&T exaggerates the supposed impact of the CABS bill processing periods on the ability of CLECs to open electronic trouble tickets. AT&T claims it was unaware of the "interim status" period and argues bill processing places it at a "serious competitive disadvantage" when it comes to opening electronic trouble reports. As set out in detail below, AT&T's claims are simply not true.

2. SWBT has explained previously that, if a CLEC's UNE-P service order completes on or shortly after the billing date that the CLEC has selected for that line, then the order will

[1] This lack of competitive significance is confirmed by AT&T's own admission that it did not become aware of the so-called "consequences that result from SWBT's failure to update LMOS records" until March 2001 – well over three years into the section 271 process for SWBT. AT&T's Willard Decl. ¶ 15, CC Docket 01-88 (filed Apr. 24, 2001); accord Ex parte Letter from Richard E. Young to Magalie Roman Salas, CC Docket 01-88 at 7 (May 24, 2001) at 7 ("May 24 Ex parte Letter").

be held in "interim status" and will not be allowed to post to CABS until after the bill processing period ends. This "interim" process is intended to ensure that CLEC's UNE-P bills contain the correct information. See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 15.

3. There are three CABS bill dates – the 5th, 15th, and 25th of the month. See id.[2] A billing period runs from the bill date to the day before the bill date in the following month – for example, the 25th bill period for October would include all UNE-P lines in service from September 25 through and including October 24. To help ensure that all UNE-P orders that complete provisioning on or before October 24 are included in the CLEC's October bill, SWBT allows three to four business days for such service orders to post to CABS before pulling the billing data.[3] New service orders that complete in this three to four business day period are not allowed to post to CABS, in order to make sure billing for the 25th bill date is as accurate as possible. If such new orders were allowed to post to CABS before SWBT pulled the billing data for October, SWBT's October 25th bills would improperly contain charges for services that the CLEC did not actually receive during this bill period.[4]

4. One or more CLEC UNE elements are arranged into a single group for billing purposes; these groups are referred to as CABS Billing Account Numbers, or CABS BANs.[5] All UNE-P lines associated with a particular CABS BAN are billed on the bill date specified for that BAN. CLECs may choose to utilize more than one CABS BAN and may select one, two, or three of the available bill dates. See, e.g., Flynn-MO Aff. ¶¶ 18, 20. However, each individual UNE-P line is associated with only one CABS BAN and, therefore, only one bill period.

5. For example, if a CLEC were to send a UNE-P conversion order with a due date of October 25, and assign it to a BAN associated with the 25th bill period, that UNE-P line should appear on the CLEC's November bill, as explained above. To ensure that this occurs, when provisioning for that order completes on October 25, the "C" service order will be held in "interim status" – and will not post to CABS or be sent to downstream systems – until the data for the CLEC's October bill has been pulled from CABS.

---

[2] Contrary to AT&T's claim, SWBT did not "note[] that in Texas there are two bill cycles each month." Ex parte Letter at 2. Instead, SWBT noted that, in Texas, AT&T has chosen to use two of the three available CABS billing dates (specifically, AT&T currently bills its UNE-P orders in Texas on the 5th billing date while TCG, its subsidiary, bills its UNE-P orders in Texas on the 5th and 25th billing dates). See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 17 n.8. There are three CABS billing dates in all five states within SWBT's region; CLECs may choose to use one, two, or all three dates. See Flynn-MO Aff. ¶¶ 18, 20. The multiple billing dates are used to manage the monthly billing workload. For similar reasons, the Customer Record Information System ("CRIS"), which handles retail and resale billing, spreads the billing over fifteen different dates. See id. ¶ 19.

[3] For the October 25th bill date this year, data will be pulled from CABS on October 29 in the Houston data center and on October 30 in all other data centers in SWBT's five-state region. For all three CABS billing dates, CABS bills are pulled from the Houston data center one business day prior to the other data centers in order to ensure that there are no region-wide billing problems for that billing date.

[4] These features of the CABS billing system – the three billing dates and the use of "interim status" to ensure accurate billing – date back to divestiture.

[5] See LMOS Aff. ¶ 22, n.11; see also LMOS Reply Aff. Attach. L.

6. However, if the CLEC were to assign that UNE-P conversion order to a BAN associated with the 5th or 15th bill period, the "C" order would not be held in "interim status" during the 25th bill processing period. Instead, it would post to CABS and then to downstream systems, such as LMOS. In other words, the bill processing period for UNE-P lines associated with the 25th bill date has no impact at all on the posting of service orders for UNE-P lines associated with a different bill period.

7. Therefore, AT&T is incorrect that UNE-P service orders will somehow be affected by multiple billing cycles. See Ex parte Letter at 2. Any given UNE-P service order is associated with only one billing date. Moreover, only UNE-P service orders that complete on the billing date for that order, or within the three to four business days afterwards, will be held in "interim status." Finally, AT&T (operating under its TCG subsidiary) uses only one billing date for UNE-P in Missouri (the 25th), and TCG is in the process of moving all of its UNE-P accounts in Texas to a single billing date (the 25th). See supra n.2. (AT&T itself uses only one billing date – the 5th – for UNE-P in Texas.) AT&T's implication that it cannot enter trouble tickets during 20 percent of the business days in a month is therefore misleading – the only line records that potentially could be in disconnected status as a result of "interim status" are those few UNE-P lines with service order activity that completes on or shortly after the billing date and that involves one of the order types listed below (see infra ¶ 18).

8. Moreover, as noted above, those CLECs that use multiple billing dates for their UNE-P lines can act to reduce the likelihood of "interim status" affecting its UNE-P conversion orders. Assuming such a CLEC is concerned that "interim status" may prevent it from opening a trouble ticket electronically on a UNE-P conversion within the first few days after provisioning – an extremely unlikely scenario given the very few trouble tickets opened in those days and the high percentage of trouble tickets that CLECs open manually by choice, see LMOS Reply Aff. ¶¶ 38 n.26, 57 & Attach. I – the CLEC merely has to select a BAN with a different billing date for the UNE-P line. In other words, such a CLEC should select a BAN with the 5th or 15th billing date for orders due for completion on or shortly after the 25th of the month.

9. AT&T's claim that the "interim status" involved in ensuring that CLECs receive accurate UNE bills is a "previously unacknowledged, serious problem" with LMOS of which it "was unaware" is both disingenuous and wrong. Ex parte Letter at 2 & n.2. First, SWBT has explained in detail to AT&T and the CLECs that "C" orders post to LMOS after they post to CABS.[6] SWBT also has explained the operation of "interim status" in CABS to

[6] See, e.g., LMOS Aff. ¶¶ 10-11, 15-16, 18, 20; LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 15; see also, e.g., Noland-MO Aff. ¶ 49.

CLECs on numerous occasions.[7] As such, AT&T has no cause for "surprise" at the effect of "interim status" on the posting of "C" orders to CABS and SWBT's downstream systems.

10. Second, AT&T has provided no evidence in this record – nor has any other CLEC – that the billing process has prevented it from opening an actual trouble ticket electronically. Although 118 of the completed service orders listed in Attachments 1 and 2 to the Willard/Van de Water Declaration were apparently held in interim status for the 25th bill period at the time AT&T attempted its "pseudo"-trouble ticket submission on those lines, AT&T never once claims that an end user experienced an actual trouble on any of those lines.[8] Based on its own investigation, SWBT has determined that AT&T opened a trouble ticket, to report an actual end-user trouble, on only one of those lines within the first three days after provisioning. Moreover, although AT&T chose to submit this trouble ticket manually, it could have submitted the trouble ticket electronically, because that ticket was submitted on the day of installation. See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 8 n.2; LMOS Aff. ¶ 33. Indeed, SWBT has confirmed that the line record for this line was not in disconnected status at the time the manual trouble ticket was opened.[9]

---

[7] For example, SWBT's internal records reflect that SWBT's account team met with AT&T on September 29, 1999, to discuss the posting of orders to SWBT's billing systems and that SWBT's account team explained that posting will be delayed when an order completes during the interim bill period. Third, as part of the Texas PUC's six month review, a SWBT witness testified that: "If an order is trying to post at the same time the bill pull is being taken, the order, whether it's a UNE combo or UNE loop, cannot post." Transcript of Workshop, Section 271 Compliance Monitoring of SWBT of Texas, Project Nos. 20400 & 22165, at 111-12 (Texas PUC June 8, 2000). Third, during hearings before the Texas Commission as part of the Texas 271 proceeding, a SWBT witness testified that an "order would go into interim status and would not post" to the billing systems "because the billing period's being pulled," and that this "period of time that exists where we literally do not allow something to post to the database because the databases are in the process of being used to issue bills is normally about three working days." SWBT Texas 271 Application, App. C, Tab 1282, at 1861-63 (Texas PUC Oct. 13, 1998). Similar testimony was filed before the Missouri Commission as part of the Missouri 271 proceeding. See Direct Testimony of John A. Locus at 6, SWBT Arkansas/Missouri 271 Application, App. C-MO, Tab 1 (MO PSC filed Nov. 20, 1998). SWBT was able to identify these four instances through a brief search of the voluminous records of various section 271-related hearings and meetings. SWBT believes the issue was discussed with AT&T, and with CLECs generally, on numerous other occasions.

[8] Although AT&T claims it informed SWBT of the summary results of its attempt on July 28 to open "pseudo"-trouble tickets on UNE-P lines in Missouri, see Ex parte Letter at 3, it never even claims to have informed SWBT of its attempts to open "pseudo"-trouble tickets in August in both Missouri and Texas. Moreover, it has continually failed to provide SWBT with contemporaneous information about the claims it has made in this proceeding about alleged difficulties in opening "pseudo"-trouble tickets. (Indeed, it states that it raised the results of its July 28 actions on August 9.) Finally, although AT&T may not like the term "pseudo"-trouble ticket, see id. at 3 n.3, it now has admitted that its reported problems with LMOS never occurred during an attempt to report an actual end-user trouble, see id. ("no trouble tickets were opened"); LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 11 n.6.

[9] This trouble ticket was opened on August 28, 2001 – the day before AT&T attempted to open the Missouri "pseudo"-trouble tickets summarized in Attachment 2 to the Willard/Van de Water Declaration. Installation on the UNE-P line in question was completed on the 28th. The trouble ticket was input at 4:48 p.m., indicating that call forwarding was not working. SWBT resolved the problem at 5:11 p.m. that same day, after confirming that the line should have had the call forwarding feature. Neither the "D" nor the "C" service order posted in LMOS prior to the time the trouble ticket was submitted. Cf. LMOS Aff. ¶ 33.

11. Finally, SWBT's analyses of the posting of service orders to LMOS accounted for the consequences of the CABS billing process.[10] UNE-P conversion orders that completed on or shortly after each of the three CABS billing dates were included in the 425 orders that SWBT reviewed in its analyses.[11] Nonetheless, SWBT found that over 62 percent of the orders it reviewed posted correctly to LMOS on Day 0 – the day of installation – and that over 95 percent posted correctly within three days after installation. See LMOS Reply Aff. Attach. G-1.

12. For a concrete example of how the interim status has no substantial impact on a CLEC's ability to open electronic trouble reports, consider that, in Missouri in July, SWBT processed 3,929 UNE-P service orders that could have generated a trouble report within the first three days after provisioning. See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 47. Based on SWBT's analysis of LMOS posting, about 196 of those UNE-P service orders (about 5 percent) would not have posted to LMOS in the first three days after installation. CLECs submit trouble tickets on approximately 0.77 percent of UNE-P lines with service order activity during the first three days after installation. See id. ¶ 38 n.26. Therefore, we can expect that CLECs submitted only 1 or 2 trouble tickets on those 196 lines. (This is confirmed by the fact that AT&T opened only one trouble ticket on the 118 lines completed on or shortly after its billing date in Missouri in July and August – 0.85 percent.)

13. Therefore, even if one were to make the extremely implausible assumption that the CABS interim status process accounted for all of the 196 UNE-P orders not posted to LMOS within three days after installation, interim status at most would have impacted trouble reports submitted on 1 or 2 – or about 0.05 percent – of the 3,929 UNE-P service orders submitted by Missouri CLECs in July.

14. As discussed above, SWBT's CRIS billing system also uses "interim status" for each of its fifteen billing dates to ensure accurate retail and resale bills. Thus, there can also be a delay in retail orders posting to LMOS while they are held in "interim status." If such a delay results in a line record being in disconnected status, SWBT's retail customers are unable to use TBTA[12] or SWBT's Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system to open a

---

[10] AT&T now contends that, with respect to 63 telephone numbers it provided SWBT on May 25 and July 9, it "had attempted to access the TBTA interface to the LMOS database for these numbers, but found it was not correctly identified as the 'owner' of these numbers." Ex parte Letter at 3. AT&T's claim is flatly inconsistent with previously filed statements on this issue. Indeed, AT&T has stated explicitly that it used Verigate, a pre-ordering and ordering interface that is part of SWBT's Toolbar platform, to investigate these 63 numbers, not TBTA. See May 24 Ex parte Letter at 3 n.6 ("AT&T used SWBT's Toolbar Administration to determine the AECN (the CLEC's identifying number) on the customer service records (via Verigate) for the orders that it reviewed . . . .") (emphasis added). As SWBT explained, checking the customer service record ("CSR") via Verigate is not an effective means of determining the status of an LMOS line record because the information on the CSR is retrieved from the CRIS billing system. See LMOS Aff. ¶ 38 n.23. Because the CSR in CRIS is updated by the new connect ("N") order and LMOS is updated by the "C" order, the fact that the CSR has not yet been updated is unrelated to whether the LMOS line record has been updated correctly. In its comments in this proceeding, AT&T disputed SWBT's claims about Verigate, but did not deny that it used Verigate to investigate these 63 lines. See AT&T's Willard/Van de Water Decl. ¶ 13 n.4.

[11] See LMOS Aff. Attach. G ("C Service Order Completion Date" column); LMOS Reply Aff. Attach. B (same).

[12] Some large retail customers use TBTA, just as CLECs do.

trouble ticket without assistance from SWBT's retail personnel. If a retail customer instead calls SWBT's customer service representatives, those retail personnel can open a trouble ticket in the same manner that the LOC personnel would open a trouble ticket for a CLEC.

15. Thus, SWBT's maintenance and repair functionality enables CLECs "to perform maintenance and repair functions 'in substantially the same time and manner' as [it] provides its retail customers." Pennsylvania Order App. C, ¶ 38. As SWBT has shown, a delay in posting that prevents the electronic submission of a CLEC trouble ticket – including delays caused by "interim status" – will occur on roughly one out of every 500 CLEC UNE-P service orders.[13]

16. And, as SWBT has demonstrated, for those extremely few trouble tickets that CLECs cannot open electronically, SWBT has resolved manually submitted troubles slightly faster than electronically submitted troubles. See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 56; LMOS Aff. ¶ 47. SWBT further demonstrated that, on average, only 4 to 5 minutes are required for a CLEC to enter a telephone number into TBTA, receive the "disconnected or ported out" message, contact the LOC to report the trouble manually, and have the trouble ticket entered into SWBT's repair system. See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶¶ 51-55.

17. AT&T now argues that this "additional and unnecessary 4 to 5 minutes in processing a trouble ticket will be of great significance for a CLEC handling commercial volumes of orders." Ex parte Letter at 4. In making this assertion, AT&T completely ignores that, throughout SWBT's five-state region (which indisputably handles commercial volumes of orders), CLECs submit roughly half of their UNE-P trouble tickets manually, apparently by choice. See LMOS Reply Aff. Attach. I.[14] This percentage is far in excess of the number of tickets that could potentially have been impacted by a disconnected LMOS record. See id. ¶ 57.[15] Moreover, AT&T further ignores that, due to SWBT's actions to improve the posting of UNE-P orders to LMOS and to ensure that UNE-P line records in LMOS are correctly in working status, the number of trouble tickets that must

[13] See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 45 (any delay in the posting of UNE-P service orders to LMOS should not affect 98.9 percent of all CLEC UNE-P trouble tickets or 99.86 percent of UNE-P customers).

[14] AT&T itself opened *** *** of its UNE-P trouble tickets manually over the past 15 months. See LMOS Reply Aff. Attach. I.

[15] AT&T again asserts that, when it submits a manual trouble ticket, "further delay inevitably results as SWBT and the CLEC resolve the confusion over who is the true 'owner' of the circuit." Ex parte Letter at 4. As SWBT has demonstrated, "talk time" in submitting manual tickets was, on average, only 30 seconds longer when the LMOS line record did not show the CLEC as the owner of the circuit, showing that any further delay is both minimal and far from inevitable. See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶¶ 53-54.

be submitted manually as a result of the status of UNE-P line records in LMOS should be miniscule.[16]

TOTAL CLEC UNE-P LINE ACTIVITY

18. As SWBT has explained, and the DOJ recognized, the number of line records changed to working status in the comparison and update process cannot be compared to the net growth in UNE-P records to arrive at an LMOS "error" rate. See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 26. Net growth in UNE-P lines simply does not reflect the total CLEC UNE-P line activity that could have resulted in a disconnected LMOS line record in the period between comparison and update processes. See id. ¶¶ 26-27. SWBT explained that seven types of activity could result in disconnected status for a UNE-P line record in LMOS at the time the LMOS database is compared with CABS and updated:

- UNE-P New Connects
- Conversions of service from SWBT retail or CLEC resale to UNE-P;
- CLEC-to-CLEC UNE-P conversions;
- CLEC UNE-P BAN changes (i.e., the movement of UNE-P lines from one BAN to another);
- CLEC UNE-P Outside Moves (i.e., movement of service to new address);
- Changes to establish Hunting on existing UNE-P lines; and
- Changes to Telephone Numbers on existing UNE-P lines.

Id. ¶ 28. SWBT explained further that comparing the total UNE-P line activity to the number of line records updated to working status still does not reveal an LMOS "error" rate, because the comparison and update process involves a snapshot of the LMOS database and will find instances in which a line is working in CABS but disconnected in LMOS for reasons unrelated to any error condition. See id. ¶¶ 32, 36.

19. In response to SWBT's evidence, AT&T claims that the only statistic "meaningfully tailored to assess the competitive consequences of the problems with LMOS" would compare the number of UNE-P conversion orders to the number of those conversion orders that were incorrectly in disconnected status at the time of a comparison and update. Ex parte Letter at 5. AT&T bases this claim on three propositions, all of which are wrong.

---

[16] AT&T argues that manual submission of trouble tickets is likely to lead to errors, see Ex parte Letter at 4. Yet, over the past fifteen months, manually submitted trouble tickets were resolved slightly faster than electronically submitted tickets. See LMOS Reply Aff. Attach. I. Moreover, CLECs can also introduce errors when entering tickets electronically into TBTA, and there is no reason to think that SWBT's experienced wholesale staff (who, as noted above, handle about half of CLECs' trouble tickets because that is how CLECs have chosen to do business) are more likely to introduce errors than the CLECs themselves. Finally, any such errors on SWBT's part would delay resolution of CLECs' trouble tickets and be reflected in performance results measuring the mean time to repair.

20. First, AT&T argues that the "competitive risks" "immediately after conversion" are greater with UNE-P conversion orders than with other types of UNE-P orders that can result in a disconnected line record. Id. at 4-5. AT&T further argues that this period is "critical" because "trouble is likely and the customer [is] most sensitive to out-of-parity treatment." Id. at 4. But this is pure speculation, unsupported by any evidence. Indeed, the evidence overwhelmingly demonstrates that troubles affect only an extremely small percentage of new UNE-P service orders – at least 99.84 percent of UNE-P customers are unaffected by any possible delay in the posting of "C" orders to LMOS. See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 45 & Attach. G. Moreover, SWBT has shown that there is no basis for AT&T's claim that trouble is most likely to occur immediately after conversion. See id. ¶ 38 (less than 2.5 percent of all AT&T trouble tickets are submitted during this time).

21. Second (and again with no support), AT&T asserts that "CLEC service orders for which the LMOS database has not yet been updated are most likely to be UNE-P conversions." Ex parte Letter at 3 (emphasis added). AT&T similarly asserts that some types of UNE-P line activity are "less complicated activities with very high success rates," resulting in "skewed . . . error rates." Id. at 5 (emphasis added). AT&T is just making this up. In fact, all seven types of CLEC UNE-P line activity can result in a disconnected record in LMOS because all involve inward and outward activity. See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 28 & nn.16-17. None is inherently more simple or measurably more likely than the others to post to LMOS successfully.

22. Third, AT&T does not dispute that over 99.5 percent of the UNE-P lines in the LMOS database are correctly in working status, but derides this as an "essentially meaningless" statistic. Ex parte Letter at 4. This statement is truly astounding. Because CLECs open the vast majority of their trouble tickets on their lines long after they have been provisioned – as noted above, over 97.5 percent of AT&T's UNE-P trouble tickets are submitted more than three days after a service order for its UNE-P line is provisioned – the overall status of the LMOS database is an immensely meaningful statistic, because it confirms that AT&T and other CLECs can open the overwhelming majority of their trouble tickets electronically.

23. Finally, SWBT currently is unable to break its data down in the manner suggested by AT&T. See Ex parte Letter at 5. Neither the Uniform Service Order Code of "RBQ," obtained from the LMOS Service Order file and used to identify UNE-P line activity, nor the CABS data extract can be used to distinguish among the seven UNE-P line activity types listed in paragraph 18, above. See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶¶ 30-31. Obtaining this information would involve an intensive manual review of each service order and each LMOS line record updated to working status in order to identify the type of UNE-P line activity, or the creation of entirely new programming to accomplish the same task. Both of these would be tremendous undertakings. They would also provide little benefit, given both the evidence demonstrating the timeliness of the LMOS update process and the lack of evidence that delays in posting have had any actual impact on a CLEC's ability to submit electronic trouble tickets.

OCTOBER 15 COMPARISON AND UPDATE

24. Attachment A provides the results for the October 15 comparison and update. See LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 8. As with prior comparison and update results submitted, this evidence confirms that, at any given time, over 99.5% of the UNE-P line records in LMOS are correctly in working status. See id.

25. Attachment B updates the table presented as Attachment E to the LMOS Reply Affidavit to include the results of the October 15 comparison and update as well as the information on the total CLEC UNE-P line activity since the October 1 comparison and update. See id. ¶¶ 26-36.[17]

LMOS PROGRAMMING UPDATE

26. In the LMOS Reply Affidavit, SWBT explained that the results for Dallas in the September 18 comparison and update "were impacted by a new BE294 programming issue that SWBT currently is attempting to isolate and correct." LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 35; id. Attach. A-3 n.†. SWBT can now provide the following update:

27. In the LMOS Affidavit, SWBT explained that:

> LMOS utilizes two programs to identify and process UNE-P service orders from the BU340 and BJ501 files. One of these programs (the BE299) identifies and creates a list of UNE-P service order[] numbers from both files. The other LMOS program (the BE294) then uses the BE299 list to update LMOS with the specified UNE-P service orders from the BJ501 file.

LMOS Aff. ¶ 41 n.25.

28. In the course of its investigation of the results for Dallas in the September 18 comparison and update, SWBT determined in October that the BE299 program had identified one service order on the BU340 file as being both a UNE-P "D" order and an LNP order. Thus, the output file from the BE299 program had two entries for one service order. This, in turn, prevented the BE294 program (which expects only one entry per service order) from matching all the subsequent UNE-P orders in the BE299 output file with the service order file (BU340). As a result, the UNE-P orders in the BE294 output file were not loaded into LMOS, leaving the line records in their existing status. The line records that were incorrectly in disconnected status were corrected in the September 18 comparison and update processes.

29. To prevent this problem from recurring, SWBT has modified the BE299 program to write only one entry per service order when reading the BU340 file. Because there will only be

[17] Simultaneous with the October 15 comparison and update, SWBT also corrected the name and user address information on the approximately 2,800 AT&T UNE-P line records described in the LMOS Reply Affidavit, ¶ 17 n.8.

one entry per service order, the BE294 program should now be able to process correctly the UNE-P orders from the BJ501 file.[18]

30. In addition, SWBT has in place methods and procedures to alert it if there are valid UNE-P orders in the BJ501 file, but no UNE-P orders in the BE294 output file. If that occurs, those methods and procedures call for SWBT to investigate whether the BE294 output file should contain UNE-P orders before the nightly LMOS update process continues.

SERVICE ORDER ERRORS

31. As SWBT has explained previously, "although SWBT's systems are designed such that 'D' and 'C' orders will post to LMOS in the correct sequence on retail and resale to UNE-P conversions, service order or other system errors may still occur that result in the LMOS record improperly remaining in disconnected status." LMOS Aff. ¶ 27 (footnotes omitted). In the LMOS Affidavit, SWBT provided two examples of system errors that prevented UNE-P service orders from posting correctly to LMOS and explained how it had corrected those errors. See id. ¶ 41 n.25. SWBT described another such system error in the LMOS Reply Affidavit, see LMOS Reply Aff. ¶ 35 & Attach. A-3 n.†, and it explained how it rectified that error, see supra ¶¶ 26-30.

32. In addition, service order errors can prevent "D" or "C" orders from posting. For example, on a retail to UNE-P conversion, LMOS compares the customer code on the retail line record to the customer code on the "D" order. If the customer code in LMOS is incorrect, it will not match the code contained on the "D" order (which is populated by SORD), and the "D" order will not post to LMOS. If the "C" order attempts to post later in that same nightly cycle, it will find a working LMOS line record and also will not post. "D" orders that do not post because of customer code errors are corrected through a mechanized process that corrects and then disconnects the LMOS line record. Either the LDRC or the twice-monthly comparison and update process will then build the LMOS line record and place it into working status.

33. To take another example, on a CLEC-to-CLEC conversion, LMOS sequences the "C-out" and "C-in" orders based on order number; a "C-out" order should have a lower order number than the corresponding "C-in" order. See also LMOS Aff. ¶ 27 n.16 (describing the CLEC-to-CLEC UNE-P conversion process). If the "C-out" and "C-in" orders are manually generated, it is possible for the "C-out" order inadvertently to be given a higher order number than the "C-in" order. If this happens, LMOS will attempt to post the "C-in" order before the "C-out" order. The "C-in" order will not post (because it finds a

[18] Now, when the BE299 program identifies an order as both an LNP and a UNE-P order, it will write only an LNP entry for the order on the output file. The decision was made to write the LNP entry to the output file rather than the UNE-P entry because UNE-P "D" orders are not processed in LMOS from the BU340 file (the "D" order associated with a UNE-P conversion from resale or retail is identified in LMOS as a resale or retail order, not as a UNE-P order). See also LMOS Aff. ¶¶ 22-23 (explaining programming change to prevent posting to LMOS of erroneous CABS "D" orders); Ex parte Letter from Geoffrey M. Klineberg to Magalie Roman Salas Attach. at 9-10, CC Docket No. 01-194 (Oct. 1, 2001) (same). For auditing purposes, the BE299 program will also write an entry for the UNE-P "D" order to the program messages log.

working UNE-P line record); the "C-out" order will post, leaving the line record in disconnected status. Either the LDRC or the twice-monthly comparison and update process will then build the LMOS line record and place it into working status.

34. Although such service order errors are possible, the evidence that SWBT has presented – in particular, the results of the comparison and update processes and the total CLEC UNE-P line order activity – demonstrates that such errors have an extremely limited impact on a CLEC's ability to submit an electronic trouble ticket. First, the number of UNE-P line records placed in working status during the comparison and update processes is extremely small – whether viewed in absolute numbers, as a percentage of all UNE-P lines, or as a percentage of total CLEC UNE-P line activity. Second, because the comparison and update process occurs twice monthly, those few line records that are incorrectly in disconnected status will remain so for a maximum of about two weeks.

Attachment A

LMOS/CABS Comparison and Update

Effective October 15, 2001

STATE OR AREA	TOTAL CABS UNE-P RECORDS	TOTAL LMOS RECORDS DISCONNECTED/ WORKING IN CABS	TOTAL LMOS RECORDS PLACED IN WORKING STATUS/UPDATED	% UPDATED
DALLAS	355303	415	415	0.12%
HOUSTON	403123	951	951	0.24%
SAN ANTONIO	490720	197	197	0.04%
TEXAS TOTAL	1249146	1563	1563	0.13%
MISSOURI	65614	115	115	0.18%
KANSAS	62409	24	24	0.04%
ARKANSAS	8729	1	1	0.01%
OKLAHOMA	30054	65	65	0.22%
MOKA TOTAL	166806	205	205	0.12%
SWBT TOTAL	**1,415,952**	**1,768**	**1,768**	**0.12%**

Attachment B

LMOS / CABS Comparison and Update Process
Line Records Updated as a Percentage of Total CLEC UNE-P Line Activity

	June 6 Comparison	July 19 Comparison	August 2 Comparison	August 21 Comparison	September 10 Comparison	September 18 Comparison †	October 1 Comparison ‡	October 15 Comparison	Total
Missouri									
Number Updated			39	70	28	56	81	115	389
Net growth from last comparison			1037	1155	671	392	1396	1952	6603
Total CLEC UNE-P line activity			2298	3101	2503	1247	2632	3182	14963
Percent Updated			1.70%	2.26%	1.12%	4.49%	3.08%	3.61%	2.60%
Total order activity factor			2.22	2.68	3.73	3.18	1.89	1.63	2.27
Arkansas									
Number Updated			7	21	11	2	2	1	44
Net growth from last comparison			1042	932	339	325	190	122	2950
Total CLEC UNE-P line activity			1283	1254	674	529	418	413	4571
Percent Updated			0.55%	1.67%	1.63%	0.38%	0.48%	0.24%	0.96%
Total order activity factor			1.23	1.35	1.99	1.63	2.20	3.39	1.55
Kansas									
Number Updated			48	47	40	15	1119	24	1293
Net growth from last comparison			615	575	672	436	2586	3781	8665
Total CLEC UNE-P line activity			1707	1810	1864	828	3566	4755	14530
Percent Updated			2.81%	2.60%	2.15%	1.81%	31.38%	0.50%	8.90%
Total order activity factor			2.78	3.15	2.77	1.90	1.38	1.26	1.68
Oklahoma									
Number Updated			15	28	9	4	12	65	133
Net growth from last comparison			565	814	633	374	1290	1158	4834
Total CLEC UNE-P line activity			1415	1709	1467	756	1917	1758	9022
Percent Updated			1.06%	1.64%	0.61%	0.53%	0.63%	3.70%	1.47%
Total order activity factor			2.50	2.10	2.32	2.02	1.49	1.52	1.87
MOKA									
Number Updated			109	166	88	77	1214	205	1859
Net growth from last comparison			3259	3476	2315	1527	5462	7013	23052
Total CLEC UNE-P line activity			6703	7874	6508	3360	8533	10108	43086
Percent Updated			1.63%	2.11%	1.35%	2.29%	14.23%	2.03%	4.31%
Total order activity factor			2.06	2.27	2.81	2.20	1.56	1.44	1.87

LMOS / CABS Comparison and Update Process
Line Records Updated as a Percentage of Total CLEC UNE-P Line Activity

	June 6 Comparison	July 19 Comparison	August 2 Comparison	August 21 Comparison	September 10 Comparison	September 18 Comparison †	October 1 Comparison ‡	October 15 Comparison	Total
Texas									
Number Updated			2996	1603	5936	3376	3947	1563	19421
Net growth from last comparison			8636	14667	12704	9440	4805	4773	55025
Total CLEC UNE-P line activity			39460	73045	53443	40721	34447	53264	294380
Percent Updated			7.59%	2.19%	11.11%	8.29%	11.46%	2.93%	6.60%
Total order activity factor			4.57	4.98	4.21	4.31	7.17	11.16	5.35
Dallas									
Number Updated			1357	414	530	2805	519	415	6040
Net growth from last comparison			2866	4325	3720	2293	1759	2684	17647
Total CLEC UNE-P line activity			10037	21825	15344	8081	12040	16466	83793
Percent Updated			13.52%	1.90%	3.45%	34.71%	4.31%	2.52%	7.21%
Total order activity factor			3.50	5.05	4.12	3.52	6.84	6.13	4.75
Houston									
Number Updated	635	2231	414	674	3363	113	1894	951	10275
Net growth from last comparison	9878	8262	4512	7027	6644	2395	3388	1829	43935
Total CLEC UNE-P line activity	29007	45391	16920	25938	18892	14535	14856	18592	184131
Percent Updated	2.19%	4.92%	2.45%	2.60%	17.80%	0.78%	12.75%	5.12%	5.58%
Total order activity factor	2.94	5.49	3.75	3.69	2.84	6.07	4.38	10.17	4.19
San Antonio									
Number Updated	659	3215	1225	515	2043	458	1534	197	9846
Net growth from last comparison	5540	6225	1258	3315	2340	4752	-342	260	23348
Total CLEC UNE-P line activity	30400	46225	12503	25282	19207	18105	7551	18206	177479
Percent Updated	2.17%	6.96%	9.80%	2.04%	10.64%	2.53%	20.32%	1.08%	5.55%
Total order activity factor	5.49	7.43	9.94	7.63	8.21	3.81	n/a	70.02	7.60

SWBT	(Houston and San Antonio only)								
Number Updated	1294	5446	3105	1769	6024	3453	5161	1768	28020
Net growth from last comparison	15418	14487	11895	18143	15019	10967	10267	11786	107982
Total CLEC UNE-P line activity	59407	91616	46163	80919	59951	44081	42980	63372	488489
Percent Updated	2.18%	5.94%	6.73%	2.19%	10.05%	7.83%	12.01%	2.79%	5.74%
Total order activity factor	3.85	6.32	3.88	4.46	3.99	4.02	4.19	5.38	4.52

† Due to difficulities encountered in obtaining the correct CABS extract file for the September 10 comparison, SWBT conducted a San Antonio-only comparison and update on September 24. The September 18 Comparison column reflects data from September 24, 2001 for San Antonio.

‡ The October 1, 2001 Comparison column reflects UNE-P line activity in San Antonio subsequent to the San Antonio-only September 24 comparison and update. The information in this column was added to this chart subsequent to the completion of Ernst & Young's validation of the Total CLEC UNE-P line activity information and Percent Updated calculation on this table. The same methodologies reviewed and validated by Ernst & Young were used in obtaining and calculating the data for the October 1 Comparison.